

Richard A. Smith, WSBA #21788
Brian A. Knutsen, WSBA #38806
Smith & Lowney, PLLC
2317 East John St.
Seattle, WA 98112
Tel: (206) 860-2883; Fax: (206) 860-4187

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

WILD FISH CONSERVANCY

Plaintiff,

v.

DIRK KEMPTHORNE, in his official
capacity as Secretary of the Interior; U.S.
FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE; H. DALE
HALL, in his official capacity as the
Director of the U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE
SERVICE; JULIE COLLINS, in her
official capacity as manager of the
Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery
Complex,

Defendants.

No. CV-05-181-LRS

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL
COMPLAINT

INTRODUCTION

1. Wild Fish Conservancy brings this action for declaratory and
injunctive relief to require the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (“USFWS”)
to comply with the Endangered Species Act (“ESA”), and to enjoin the
Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery (“Hatchery”), a USFWS facility, from
continuing to take native stocks of threatened bull trout in violation of the ESA.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL COMPLAINT - 1

SMITH & LOWNEY, P.L.L.C.
2317 EAST JOHN STREET
SEATTLE, WA 98112
(206) 860-2883

1 2. Wild Fish Conservancy also brings this action to require the USFWS
2 to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”) before
3 undertaking major federal actions at the Hatchery, including modification of
4 structures blocking fish passage, the construction of a major water intake and
5 wastewater pump-back project, and the adoption of a five-year management and
6 operations plan, without an analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts
7 of those actions on the environment.
8
9
10

11 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

12 3. This Court has jurisdiction over Wild Fish Conservancy’s ESA and
13 NEPA claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question), 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)
14 (ESA citizen suit provision), and 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706 (Administrative Procedure
15 Act). The requested relief is also proper under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 (declaratory
16 relief) and 28 U.S.C. § 2202 (injunctive relief).
17
18
19

20 4. As required by the ESA, 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g), Plaintiff Wild Fish
21 Conservancy has furnished Defendants with written notices of intent to sue more
22 than sixty days ago in letters postmarked March 17, 2005, and October 18, 2006.
23 A copy of the later of these notices of intent to sue is attached to this complaint as
24 Exhibit 1, and is incorporated herein by reference. Defendants have not remedied
25 the alleged violations; they are ongoing and likely to continue.
26
27
28

1 commented on federal and state actions that affect state waters. Wild Fish
2 Conservancy routinely seeks to compel governmental agencies, including the
3 USFWS, to follow the laws designed to protect native fish species, particularly
4 including threatened and endangered species.
5

6 8. Wild Fish Conservancy's members derive scientific, recreational,
7 health, conservation, spiritual, and aesthetic benefits from the preservation and
8 protection of native fish species. More specifically, Wild Fish Conservancy's
9 members spend time in areas, including the Icicle Creek area, that are adversely
10 affected by Defendants' failures to comply with environmental protection laws,
11 and its members reside near and regularly visit these areas, including the Icicle
12 Creek area.
13
14
15

16 9. Wild Fish Conservancy's members use Icicle Creek for recreation and
17 spiritual renewal. These members derive recreational, scientific and aesthetic
18 benefits from the existence of a healthy ecosystem and from wild fish, including
19 bull trout, in Icicle Creek. These members observe, study, photograph, and
20 appreciate Icicle Creek's native fish populations. In addition, these members have
21 met with, negotiated with, and worked closely with USFWS personnel concerning
22 native fish passage issues and Hatchery operations.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 10. Wild Fish Conservancy members have also suffered procedural and
2 informational harms connected to their substantive, conservation, recreation, and
3 scientific activities resulting from Defendants' violations of environmental laws.
4 These members rely in part on ESA consultation and NEPA evaluation processes
5 to protect threatened and endangered species from injuries inflicted by Hatchery
6 activities.
7

8
9 11. The past, present, and future enjoyment of these benefits, including
10 the recreational, aesthetic, and scientific interests of Wild Fish Conservancy
11 members, has been, is being, and will continue to be harmed by Defendants'
12 failures to comply with environmental laws. Processes required by these laws
13 provide decision makers, Wild Fish Conservancy, and the public with essential
14 information regarding the effects of government actions on threatened and
15 endangered species.
16

17
18 12. These injuries are actual, concrete injuries fairly traceable to
19 Defendants' violations of environmental laws that the Court may remedy by
20 declaring that Defendants' activities are illegal and enjoining Defendants from
21 taking further illegal action.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 13. Defendant Dirk Kempthorne is the Secretary of the Interior and, as
2 such, is the federal official ultimately responsible for ensuring that the USFWS
3 complies with the ESA and NEPA.
4

5 14. Defendant USFWS is an executive branch department within the
6 Department of the Interior. USFWS is responsible for administering the provisions
7 of the ESA and is the agency that owns and operates the Hatchery.
8

9 15. Defendant H. Dale Hall is the Director of the USFWS.
10

11 16. Defendant Julie Collins is the Complex Manager of the Hatchery and,
12 as such, is responsible for the Hatchery's compliance with environmental laws.
13

14 STATUTORY BACKGROUND

15 The Endangered Species Act

16
17 17. ESA is a federal statute enacted to provide a program to conserve
18 threatened and endangered species and to protect the ecosystems upon which those
19 species depend. 16 U.S.C. § 1531(b). To this end, ESA requires the Secretaries of
20 the Interior and of Commerce to list such species as threatened or endangered. 16
21 U.S.C. § 1533.
22

23
24 18. Section 9 of the ESA and its implementing regulations prohibit any
25 person, including federal agencies, from "taking" a threatened or endangered
26 species. 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1); 50 C.F.R. § 227.21. "Taking" is defined broadly
27
28

1 under ESA to include harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding,
2 killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting, or attempting to engage in any such
3 conduct regarding a protected species either directly or by degrading its habitat
4 sufficiently to impair essential behavior patterns. 16 U.S.C. § 1532(19); 50 C.F.R.
5 § 222.102.
6

7
8 19. “Take” by federal agencies is permitted if, upon completion of formal
9 consultation, the agency receives an incidental take statement under Section
10 7(b)(4). An incidental take statement specifies the impact of any incidental take,
11 provides for reasonable and prudent measures necessary to minimize impacts, and
12 sets forth terms and conditions that must be followed. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(b)(4).
13
14

15 20. Section 7(a)(2) of ESA requires all federal agencies, including
16 USFWS, to “insure that any action authorized, funded or carried out by such
17 agency ... is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or
18 threatened species.” 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2). Regulations implementing this
19 section define “jeopardize the continued existence of” as: “to engage in an action
20 that reasonably would be expected, directly or indirectly, to reduce appreciably the
21 likelihood of both the survival and recovery of a listed species in the wild by
22 reducing the reproduction, numbers, or distribution of that species.” 50 C.F.R. §
23 402.02. “Jeopardy” is evaluated on the level of a “distinct population segment” of
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 a protected species. 16 U.S.C. § 1532(16). To carry out this mandate, the agency
2 proposing to undertake the action (the “action agency”) must consult with the
3 National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS”), the delegated agency of the
4 Secretary of Commerce, or with the USFWS, the delegated agency of the Secretary
5 of the Interior, (the “expert agency”) depending on the affected species, whenever
6 the action agency’s actions “may affect” a listed species. 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)(2).
7

8
9 21. When an action agency’s actions “may affect” a listed species,
10 “formal consultation” under Section 7(a)(2) is required unless the expert agency
11 agrees that the actions are not likely to adversely affect the listed species. Id.; 50
12 C.F.R. § 402.14. Formal consultation is concluded by the expert agency’s issuance
13 of a biological opinion. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(l). In a formal consultation, the expert
14 agency must review all relevant information and use “the best available scientific
15 and commercial data available,” evaluate the current status of the listed species,
16 evaluate the effects of the action and cumulative effects on the listed species,
17 formulate its biological opinion as to whether the action, taken together with
18 cumulative effects, is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species,
19 identify reasonable and prudent alternatives if such jeopardy is found, and
20 formulate an incidental take statement. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(g). Similarly, the
21 biological opinion must include a summary of the information on which the
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 opinion is based, a detailed discussion of the effects of the action, the expert
2 agency's opinion on jeopardy and, if jeopardy is found, reasonable and prudent
3 alternatives to the action, and the incidental take statement. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(h).
4

5 22. In turn, the incidental take statement must specify the impact, "i.e., the
6 amount or extent," of incidental taking authorized, specify the reasonable and
7 prudent measures necessary or appropriate to minimize such impact, set forth the
8 terms and conditions (including, but not limited to reporting requirements) that the
9 action agency must meet to implement the reasonable and prudent measures, and
10 satisfy other requirements. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(i). To monitor the impacts of
11 incidental take, the action agency must report the progress of the action and its
12 impact on the species as specified in the incidental take statement. 50 C.F.R. §
13 402.14(i)(3).
14
15
16
17

18 23. If, during the course of the action, the amount or extent of incidental
19 taking specified by the incidental take statement is exceeded, the action agency
20 must reinitiate consultation immediately. 50 C.F.R. § 402.14(i)(4). Reinitiation of
21 consultation is also required if the new information reveals that the action may
22 affect listed species in a manner not previously considered or if the identified
23 action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed
24 species that was not considered in the biological opinion. 50 C.F.R. § 402.16.
25
26
27
28

1 24. The Section 7(a)(2) obligation of an action agency to insure that its
2 actions are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species, or a
3 distinct population segment of a listed species, exists independently of the action
4 agency's consultation responsibilities. In other words, a "no jeopardy" biological
5 opinion from an expert agency does not alone indicate that the action agency has
6 satisfied this Section 7(a)(2) obligation. See Resources Limited, Inc. v. Robertson,
7 35 F.3d 1300, 1304 (9th Cir. 1993).

8 25. Any taking of a threatened or endangered species that is in compliance
9 with the terms and conditions specified in a biological opinion shall not be
10 considered to be a prohibited taking of the species concerned. 16 U.S.C. §
11 1536(o)(2). Any taking occurring in violation of the terms and conditions of an
12 incidental take statement, or in excess of that permitted under the incidental take
13 statement, is a violation of Section 9 of the ESA. 16 U.S.C. § 1538.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20 The National Environmental Policy Act

21 26. NEPA is the "basic national charter for protection of the
22 environment." 40 C.F.R. § 1500.1. Its purposes are to "help public officials make
23 decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences, and to
24 take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment," and to "insure that
25
26
27
28

1 environmental information is available to public officials and citizens before
2 decisions are made and before actions are taken.” Id. at § 1500.1(b)-(c).

3
4 26. To accomplish these purposes, NEPA requires all agencies of the
5 federal government of prepare a “detailed statement” regarding all “major federal
6 actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment,” 42 U.S.C. §
7 4332(C), including situations where several separate actions may have a
8 cumulatively significant impact on the environment. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)(7).

9
10 This "detailed statement" is commonly known as an Environmental Impact
11 Statement (“EIS”). Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) regulations list a
12 number of factors that an agency must consider in deciding whether to prepare an
13 EIS. Id. § 1508.27. All related, similar, interconnected, or interdependent actions,
14 including proposed actions that are similar in geographic scope or extent, or that
15 will have similar environmental impacts, must be analyzed together in an EIS. Id. §
16 1501 et seq. An agency may not avoid preparation of an EIS by “breaking ...
17 down [its action] into small component parts.”

18
19 27. Before determining whether the proposed action requires an EIS, the
20 agency may prepare an environmental assessment ("EA"). Id. § 1501.4. If an
21 agency decides not to prepare an EIS, it must prepare a finding of no significant
22

1 impact (“FONSI”), which explains the agency’s reasons for its decision. Id. §
2 1501.4.

3
4 28. NEPA further provides that agencies “shall . . . study, develop, and
5 describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal
6 which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available
7 resources.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(E). This requirement is independent of the
8 determination whether or not to prepare an EIS. An alternatives analysis must be
9 prepared if an EA is required.
10

11
12 29. Even after a NEPA process is completed, where an agency learns of
13 “significant new circumstances” or new “information relevant to environmental
14 concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts,” the agency must
15 undertake further review under NEPA. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9(c).
16
17

18 The Administrative Procedure Act

19
20 30. The Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) authorizes courts
21 reviewing agency action to hold unlawful and set aside final agency action,
22 findings, and conclusions that are arbitrary and capricious, an abuse of discretion,
23 or otherwise not in accordance with law. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). EISs and EAs
24 issued under NEPA and biological opinions issued under ESA are reviewed under
25 this provision of the APA.
26
27
28

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Icicle Creek

31. Icicle Creek originates in the Cascade Mountains in Washington State and is a fourth-order tributary to the Wenatchee River, which is a tributary to the Columbia River.

32. Icicle Creek contains natural populations of steelhead trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), spring Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*), and other fish species.

33. In the upper Columbia River, an area that includes Icicle Creek, steelhead trout are listed as a threatened species and spring Chinook salmon are listed as an endangered species under the ESA. Both of these species are managed by NMFS. Spring Chinook salmon produced by the Hatchery are not protected under the ESA.

34. In the upper Columbia River, bull trout are listed as threatened species under the ESA as part of the Columbia River distinct population segment of threatened bull trout, and are managed by the USFWS.

35. Icicle Creek is listed on the State of Washington's Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list as violating state water quality standards for temperature,

1 dissolved oxygen, and pH. The Hatchery is among the entities identified as
2 contributing to the degraded condition of Icicle Creek.

3
4 36. As explained more fully below, Defendants' actions have degraded,
5 and continue to degrade, the ecosystem in Icicle Creek. Likewise, Defendants'
6 actions block and interfere with fish passage for threatened bull trout in Icicle
7 Creek.
8

9
10 The Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery

11 37. Constructed in 1939 and 1940, the Leavenworth National Fish
12 Hatchery is located approximately three miles south of the city of Leavenworth,
13 Washington, on the banks of Icicle Creek.
14

15 38. Originally designed to maintain salmon stocks blocked by
16 construction of the Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, the Hatchery
17 initially reared fish in holding ponds constructed in a one mile stretch of natural
18 channel of Icicle Creek. Hatchery operations at that time were conducted
19 principally within this stretch of Icicle Creek.
20
21

22 39. The most upstream of the holding pond structures, the headgate dam
23 or "dam 2," was used to control water flow over the fish holding ponds and divert
24 excess water into a 4,000 foot-long manmade canal sending water over a spillway
25 dam where it is returned to Icicle Creek.
26
27

1 40. Fish migrations to areas above the Hatchery were blocked by the
2 spillway at the base of the canal and by a series of dams and weirs in the natural
3 channel of Icicle Creek. Included among these blocking structures in the natural
4 channel was “dam 5,” located just upstream of the confluence of the natural
5 channel and the spillway dam.
6
7

8 41. Over time, the intermediate structures between the headgate dam (dam
9 2) and dam 5 were abandoned, and the USFWS no longer used the natural channel
10 of Icicle Creek for Hatchery fish propagation. Unfortunately, these abandoned
11 structures were left in place for decades, where they continued to block native fish
12 passage.
13
14

15 42. Although the Hatchery no longer uses the natural channel of Icicle
16 Creek to raise fish, the Hatchery continues to use the headgate dam (dam 2) to
17 divert water from Icicle Creek’s natural channel into the Hatchery’s manmade
18 canal. At most times of the year, the Hatchery’s diversion of water into its
19 manmade canal and/or other structures significantly dewateres the natural channel
20 of Icicle Creek between the headgate dam (dam 2) and dam 5.
21
22
23

24 43. When its gates are closed, the headgate dam (dam 2) also acts as a
25 barrier to upstream and downstream fish passage, including passage for
26 endangered steelhead, endangered spring Chinook salmon, and threatened bull
27
28

1 trout. When the gates are open, the headgate dam can still act as a partial barrier to
2 migration depending on water volume through the dam and the configuration of the
3 gates.
4

5 44. More than 20 miles of habitat suitable for bull trout, and other species,
6 is located in Icicle Creek and its tributaries above the headgate dam (dam 2).
7

8 45. Dam 5 also blocks upstream and downstream fish passage, including
9 passage for threatened bull trout. The Hatchery's placement of stop logs in dam 5
10 when conducting broodstock trapping activities and at other times of the year
11 blocks fish passage.
12

13 46. The Hatchery's water intake is located approximately 1.5 miles
14 upstream of the Hatchery. The water intake structure consists of a diversion dam,
15 fish ladder, wide bar trash rack, and another narrower trash rack located in a
16 building. Water is conveyed from this intake to the Hatchery, using gravity,
17 through a buried 31-inch pipe system.
18

19 47. This water enters a sand-settling basin and goes through two screening
20 chambers before use at the Hatchery.
21

22 48. To date, the USFWS has failed to install appropriate screens on its
23 water intake. The existing fish screening devices on the Hatchery's water intake
24
25
26
27
28

1 system are outdated, inefficient, and do not comply with current federal and state
2 regulatory requirements.

3
4 Start of the Icicle Creek Restoration Project

5 49. Beginning in 1998, Wild Fish Conservancy has worked with its
6 members, as well as other individuals and organizations in the Leavenworth area,
7 to restore upstream and downstream passage for fish in Icicle Creek, including
8 passage for threatened and endangered species.
9

10
11 50. After negotiating with community members, the Hatchery agreed to
12 implement a plan to restore Icicle Creek's natural channel and provide for fish
13 passage into the upper reaches of Icicle Creek.
14

15 51. In January 2002, USFWS published a Final Environmental Impact
16 Statement for the Icicle Creek Restoration Project ("ICRP FEIS"). In the ICRP
17 FEIS, USFWS stated that its preferred alternative included removal of all
18 structures in the natural channel, with the exception of the headgate dam (dam 2)
19 and dam 5, both of which were to be modified to allow for fish passage.
20
21

22 52. The ICRP FEIS expressly avoids a detailed analysis of the Hatchery's
23 water intake structure, effects of water withdrawals from that structure, or general
24 hatchery operations. Instead, the ICRP FEIS focuses on the effects related to the
25
26
27
28

1 construction and mitigation activities related to the restoration of fish passage in
2 the natural channel of Icicle Creek.

3
4 53. On March 12, 2002, USFWS issued a biological opinion addressing
5 the Icicle Creek Restoration Project (“2002 USFWS Restoration BiOp”) and
6 concluded that the restoration project was not likely to jeopardize the continued
7 existence of bull trout in the impacted segment of Icicle Creek. The terms and
8 conditions of the accompanying incidental take statement addressed demolition
9 and construction activities in the Icicle Creek channel and not ongoing hatchery
10 operations.
11
12

13
14 54. On April 3, 2002, NMFS issued a biological opinion addressing the
15 Icicle Creek Restoration Project (“2002 NMFS Restoration BiOp”), and concluded
16 that the restoration project was not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of
17 steelhead trout and spring Chinook salmon in the impacted portion of Icicle Creek.
18 The 2002 NMFS Restoration BiOp, and the terms and conditions for the
19 accompanying incidental take statement for the restoration project addressed
20 demolition and construction activities in the Icicle Creek channel and not ongoing
21 hatchery operations.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Fragmentation of the restoration project

55. After issuance of the ICRP FEIS and the record of decision for the restoration project, the Hatchery announced that it did not have adequate funding to implement the Icicle Creek Restoration Project as proposed, planned, and analyzed.

56. Frustrated by this turn of events, Wild Fish Conservancy members and other members of the Leavenworth community undertook to remove several of the long-abandoned and broken weirs, dams, and other structures littering the natural channel of Icicle Creek, including the expenditure of over \$200,000 of private funds. These efforts left only the headgate dam (dam 2) and dam 5 in the section of natural channel of Icicle Creek adjacent to the Hatchery. Wild Fish Conservancy provided technical assistance in this effort.

57. Since that time, the Hatchery has failed to remove, modify, or operate the two remaining barriers to fish passage in this section of the natural channel of Icicle Creek (the headgate dam (dam 2) and dam 5) to allow for fish passage. The Hatchery has operated its structures to the detriment of fish and habitat values in Icicle Creek.

58. As a result, at least in part, of the commencement of this action in June 2005, the Hatchery is now developing plans for further restoration of Icicle

1 Creek and for modification of Hatchery facilities, including the headgate dam (dam
2 2), dam 5, the upstream water diversion structure and its screening, and facilities
3 associated with the Hatchery's water supply system.
4

5 59. In or about the spring of 2003, USFWS obtained new data from radio-
6 tagged bull trout demonstrating that bull trout were moving back and forth between
7 the lower Wenatchee River and the main spillway at the Hatchery throughout the
8 year. Based on this new data, according to statements of a USFWS representative
9 at a June 2003 inter-agency meeting, it appears that in addition to upstream
10 spawners and downstream juveniles, resident fish in the Wenatchee and Icicle
11 systems need to be able to pass above the Hatchery facilities at all times of year.
12 This radio telemetry data, as well as other information about the impacts of the
13 Hatchery on the Icicle Creek ecosystem, was neither known nor taken into account
14 in the ICRP FEIS or the 2002 USFWS Restoration BiOp.
15
16
17
18

19 60. The Hatchery has not supplemented the ICRP FEIS, reinitiated
20 consultation with USFWS, or reinitiated consultation with NMFS in light of these
21 changes, delays and new information.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

The first bull trout biological opinion

61. When Wild Fish Conservancy initially filed this action on June 16, 2005, the Hatchery had failed to complete, or even initiate, Section 7 consultation on the effects of its structures and operations on threatened bull trout.

62. In response to Wild Fish Conservancy's claims, at least in part, the Hatchery finally undertook consultation with USFWS on these effects during the course of this lawsuit.

63. In exchange for Wild Fish Conservancy's agreement to withhold filing a motion for summary judgment on its claims concerning the Hatchery's failure to consult on impacts to bull trout, Defendants promised to complete the ESA Section 7 consultation on bull trout by September 1, 2006.

64. The Hatchery issued its biological assessment for operation and maintenance of the Hatchery with respect to impacts on bull trout on July 10, 2006.

65. On August 31, 2006, USFWS issued its first biological opinion for the operation and maintenance of the Hatchery "through 2011" ("2006 USFWS BiOp").

66. The 2006 USFWS BiOp and the Hatchery's biological assessment set forth an operational plan for the Hatchery for the period of May 2006 through December 2011. Among other things, this five-year operational plan describes

1 how the Hatchery will collect and release the fish it raises, operate its water supply
2 system, and operate the structures it controls in Icicle Creek, including the
3 headgate dam (dam 2) and dam 5.
4

5 67. Despite the requirements of NEPA, the Hatchery has prepared no EA,
6 no FONSI, no EIS, and no alternatives analysis for this five-year operational plan.
7

8 68. The 2006 USFWS BiOp concludes that the five-year operational plan
9 “is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Columbia River distinct
10 population segment of the bull trout.” 2006 USFWS BiOp at 65. However, this
11 conclusion is reached without adequate consideration of cumulative effects and
12 despite information presented in the 2006 USFWS BiOp that demonstrates both the
13 importance of the Icicle Creek bull trout population to the distinct population
14 segment and the seriousness of the effects of the five-year operational plan,
15 particularly its regime for operation of the passage blocking structures. For
16 instance, the 2006 USFWS BiOp acknowledges that spawning migration is “the
17 most critical movement necessary for survival of bull trout populations,” and that
18 the peak spawning migration time is from late May to early September “with a
19 distinct peak in the migration about one month after peak runoff” (approximately
20 mid-June). *Id.* at 45 and 46. It continues, “[d]uring this period, spawning
21 migration past [the Hatchery] is precluded by current operations at dams 2 and 5”
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 (associated with Chinook salmon broodstock collection). Id. “By mid- to late-
2 July” (after dams 2 and 5 are open) “as river flows drop, it appears that the boulder
3 area at rm 5.7 and [another diversion just upstream] are impassable because
4 insufficient flow remains in the river to surmount them.” Id. Furthermore, the
5 biological opinion notes that “the proposed action is likely to preclude
6 demographic and genetic contributions by migratory bull trout to the small known
7 resident population in Icicle Creek.” Id. at 51. The 2006 USFWS Bi-Op further
8 notes that restoration of the migratory bull trout life history to Icicle Creek (which
9 can only result from the removal of the passage barriers and impediments
10 associated with the Hatchery) would provide a significant benefit to the entire
11 Wenatchee River bull trout core area by increasing the connectivity among bull
12 trout populations within this core area. It notes that the Icicle Creek is the largest
13 tributary of the Wenatchee River and only one of the other six bull trout tributary
14 populations in the core area (the Chiwawa River population) has a relatively large
15 spawning population. Consequently, the passage blockage at Icicle Creek directly
16 threatens the recovery of bull trout in this core area.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 69. The 2006 USFWS BiOp includes an incidental take statement. The
25 incidental take statement is deficient for reasons including its failure to quantify the
26 number of bull trout of which take is authorized, except for the estimated take from
27
28

1 direct handling of individual bull trout, including by entrainment in the hatchery
2 intake and conveyance to the sand settling basin, and to the activities associated
3 with the surplusing of excess hatchery spring Chinook salmon. The total of bull
4 trout allowed to be taken is 21. The incidental take statement does not quantify the
5 take from the numerous activities that impair the essential behavior of migratory
6 bull trout, such as the Hatchery's restriction of fish passage, reductions in instream
7 flow, degradation of water quality, and flow manipulation that continues to
8 degrade habitat in the historical channel, even though the 2006 USFWS BiOp
9 describes in detail the effects of these and other activities.
10
11
12
13

14 70. This incidental take statement includes reasonable and prudent
15 measures and mandatory terms and conditions. The terms and conditions are
16 inadequate to implement the reasonable and prudent measures. For instance, term
17 and condition 16, intended to implement reasonable and prudent measure 4 –
18 “minimize the impacts of incidental take from operations of structures 2 and 5”
19 (dams 2 and 5) – requires the Hatchery only to convene a group of agencies to
20 begin development of an adaptive management strategy which is to lead to the
21 development of “a comprehensive bull trout passage plan for the Icicle Creek
22 basin.” Id at 70. This is inadequate and inappropriate given that the Hatchery's
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 five-year operational plan provides for the unconditional closure of dam 5,
2 blocking fish passage, from May 15 to July 7.

3
4 The second bull trout biological opinion

5 71. In late 2007, in response to Wild Fish Conservancy's motion for
6 summary judgment, Defendants moved for a voluntary remand of the 2006
7 USFWS BiOp. The Court granted Defendants' motion. On February 15, 2008,
8 Defendants issued a revised biological opinion, the Biological Opinion for the
9 Operation and Maintenance of the Leavenworth National Fish Hatchery through
10 2001 ("2008 USFWS BiOp").
11
12

13
14 72. The action described and the analysis provided by the 2008 USFWS
15 BiOp is substantially the same as the description and analysis provided by the 2006
16 USFWS BiOp.
17

18 73. Despite the requirements of NEPA, the Hatchery has prepared no EA,
19 no FONSI, no EIS, and no alternatives analysis for this five-year operational plan.
20

21 74. The 2008 USFWS BiOp concludes that the five-year operational plan
22 "is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the coterminous U.S.
23 population of the bull trout because the intended survival and recovery functions of
24 the Columbia River interim recovery unit are likely to be maintained." 2008
25 USFWS BiOp at 88. However, this conclusion is reached without adequate
26
27
28

1 consideration of cumulative effects and despite information presented in the 2008
2 USFWS BiOp that demonstrates both the importance of the Icicle Creek bull trout
3 population to the distinct population segment and the seriousness of the effects of
4 the five-year operational plan, particularly its regime for operation of the passage
5 blocking structures. This conclusion is contrary to fact and law.
6
7

8 75. The 2008 USFWS BiOp includes an incidental take statement. The
9 incidental take statement is deficient. The total amount of allowable take of bull
10 trout taken is 22, only one more than the 2006 USFWS BiOp, which designated no
11 take to impaired fish passage. This incidental take statement reduces the “take”
12 from operation of the inadequate water supply structure from 20 fish in the 2006
13 USFWS BiOp to only 2 fish in the 2008 USFWS BiOp, based on the fact that one
14 dead bull trout per year was observed in 2001-2004 and increased monitoring by
15 USFWS. Two fish per year is an underestimate as it is likely that many more fish
16 have been harmed than the one per year observed under an inadequate monitoring
17 plan.
18
19
20
21
22

23 76. The 2008 USFWS BiOp assigns “up to 20” threatened bull trout
24 harmed due to impaired fish passage. No basis for this number is given. Instead, it
25 appears that the USFWS merely reassigned the allowable take to different
26 categories to keep the total number of fish taken more or less the same (21 in the
27
28

1 2006 USFWS BiOp versus 22 in the 2008 USFWS BiOp) to use the same jeopardy
2 analysis found in the 2006 BiOp in the 2008 BiOp, with a finding of “no
3 jeopardy.” In fact, many more than 20 fish may be harmed due to impaired fish
4 passage, given the pristine nature of the habitat in Icicle Creek above the Hatchery.
5

6
7 77. This incidental take statement includes reasonable and prudent
8 measures and mandatory terms and conditions. The terms and conditions are
9 inadequate to implement the reasonable and prudent measures. For instance, term
10 and condition 16, intended to implement reasonable and prudent measure 4 –
11 “minimize the impacts of incidental take from operations of structures 2 and 5”
12 (dams 2 and 5) – requires the Hatchery only to “continue the adaptive management
13 process” which is to lead to the development of “a comprehensive bull trout
14 passage plan for the Icicle Creek basin.” *Id* at 95. This is inadequate and
15 inappropriate given that the Hatchery’s five-year operational plan provides for the
16 unconditional closure of dam 5, blocking fish passage, from May 15 to July 7.
17

18
19 78. The 2008 USFWS BiOp states that “the Service concludes that
20 hatchery effluent release into Icicle Creek is unlikely to cause adverse effects to the
21 bull trout.” *Id* at 81. This is unlikely to be the case given the fact that Icicle Creek
22 below the Hatchery violates state water quality criteria for dissolved oxygen and
23 pH, and the cause of these violations is excess phosphorus in the effluent
24
25
26
27
28

1 discharged from the Hatchery. The water quality criteria are in place to protect
2 aquatic life, including bull trout. This conclusion was reached because the
3 Hatchery allegedly changed feed and the BiOp says lower phosphorus
4 concentrations in the effluent “may” be due to that change in feed. Id at 80-81.
5 However, there are no assurances cited in the BiOp that the Hatchery will continue
6 with the practices , and more importantly, there is no analysis of in-stream
7 conditions to determine if the recent practices cited in the BiOp, if continued will
8 actually result in improvements to Icicle Creek through attainment of the
9 appropriate water quality criteria. A more reasonable conclusion is that the
10 Hatchery’s effluent discharge will continue to impair Icicle Creek and harm bull
11 trout.
12
13
14
15

16
17 Continued take

18 79. Current Hatchery operations are taking bull trout in the natural
19 channel of Icicle Creek. Wild Fish Conservancy has documented these fish in the
20 natural channel and their unsuccessful attempts to migrate past the Hatchery’s
21 barriers.
22
23

24 80. Furthermore, the Hatchery has not ensured that bull trout are handled
25 carefully, and has not modified the intake screening or other features of its water
26
27
28

1 supply system to prevent harm to fish. These actions result in take of listed
2 species.

3
4 81. Wild Fish Conservancy has made the Hatchery aware of all of the
5 proble81 with Hatchery operations and impacts on threatened bull trout.

6
7 82. The incidental take statement in the 2008 USFWS BiOp does not
8 consider or address harm to listed fish eggs isolated in the historic channel through
9 the Hatchery's continued blocking of fish passage and dewatering of the natural
10 channel.
11

12 83. These listed fish are harmed, among other reasons, because they are
13 prevented from reaching better habitat upstream.
14

15 84. Likewise, the Hatchery's operation of the headgate dam (dam 2) and
16 dam 5 have excluded fish upstream and downstream of the natural channel from
17 entering the natural channel. For example, by restricting movements of listed fish,
18 the Hatchery has harmed juvenile and adult life stages of the listed fish throughout
19 Icicle Creek by disrupting pre-spawning behavior, interfering with the ability of
20 spawners to find one another, and by restricting the ability of rearing juveniles to
21 seek optimal habitats within the segment of Icicle Creek that spans the area
22 immediately upstream and downstream of the historical channel. These actions
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

1 impair the chances of listed fish to successfully spawn. Hatchery activities have
2 other deleterious effects on listed fish as well.

3
4 CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

5 First Claim for Relief (ESA): 2008 USFWS BiOp inadequate

6 85. Wild Fish Conservancy realleges and incorporates by reference each
7
8 and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.

9 86. By failing to find that the Hatchery's five-year operational plan is
10
11 likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the threatened bull trout and the
12 Columbia River distinct population segment of threatened bull trout, and by failing
13
14 to satisfy legal requirements for its consultation obligations as the expert agency in
15
16 issuing the 2008 USFWS BiOp, USFWS and other Defendants have acted
17
18 arbitrarily and capriciously, abused their discretion, and acted otherwise not in
19
20 accordance with law.

21 Second Claim for Relief (ESA): Hatchery fails to insure no jeopardy

22 87. Wild Fish Conservancy realleges and incorporates by reference each
23
24 and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.

25 88. The Hatchery's operations, activities and structures are likely to
26
27 jeopardize the continued existence of the threatened bull trout and the Columbia
28

1 River distinct population segment of threatened bull trout. Defendants are thus
2 violating Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA.

3
4 Third Claim for Relief (ESA): Take of threatened bull trout

5 88. Wild Fish Conservancy realleges and incorporates by reference each
6 and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.
7

8 89. The Hatchery's operations, activities, and structure, including but not
9 limited to blockage of passage in Icicle Creek and the entrainment of fish in the
10 water supply system, result in take of threatened bull trout in violation of Section 9
11 of the ESA. Defendants are therefore in violation of the ESA.
12

13
14 Fourth Claim for Relief (NEPA): Failure to prepare an EIS on operational plan

15 90. Wild Fish Conservancy realleges and incorporates by reference each
16 and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.
17

18 91. The five-year operational plan adopted by the Hatchery and related
19 activities as described in the 2008 USFWS BiOp constitute a major federal action
20 that significantly affects the quality of the environment. Thus, preparation of an
21 EIS is required under NEPA.
22

23
24 92. Defendants have violated NEPA by failing to prepare either an EA or
25 an EIS for the five-year operational plan and related activities, or to issue a FONSI.
26

27 Fifth Claim for Relief (NEPA): Failure to prepare alternatives analysis
28

1 93. Wild Fish Conservancy realleges and incorporates by reference each
2 and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.

3 94. Defendants have violated NEPA by failing to prepare an alternatives
4 analysis for the Hatchery's five-year operational plan and related activities.
5

6 PRAYER FOR RELIEF
7

8 WHEREFORE, Wild Fish Conservancy respectfully requests that the Court:

9 A. Declare that Defendants are in violation of Section 7 of the ESA
10 because the 2008 USFWS BiOp is arbitrary and capricious or otherwise unlawful;
11

12 B. Declare that Defendants are in violation of Section 7 of the ESA
13 because they have failed to insure that their actions do not jeopardize the continued
14 existence of the Columbia River distinct population segment of the threatened bull
15 trout;
16
17

18 C. Declare that Defendants are in violation of Section 9 of the ESA by
19 taking threatened bull trout;
20

21 D. Declare that Defendants are in violation of NEPA by failing to
22 conduct environmental analysis or analyze alternatives for their five-year Hatchery
23 operational plan and related actions and by improperly segmenting their activities
24 in their environmental analyses;
25
26
27
28

1 E. Order Defendants to immediately comply with the requirements of the
2 ESA and NEPA;

3 F. Enjoin the Hatchery from conducting further operations until
4
5 compliance with the ESA and NEPA is achieved;

6 G. Grant such preliminary or permanent injunctive relief as Wild Fish
7
8 Conservancy may from time to time request during the pendency and resolution of
9
10 this case to ensure that Defendants do not irreparably injure listed species;

11 H. Award Wild Fish Conservancy its reasonable litigation expenses,
12
13 including attorney fees, expert witness fees, court costs, and other expenses
14
15 necessary for the preparation and litigation of this case under the ESA and the
16
17 Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412 et seq.; and

18 I. Grant such additional relief as the Court deems just and proper.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 Dated: May__, 2006

3 s/ Richard A. Smith
4 WSBA # 21788
5 Brian A. Knutsen
6 WSBA # 38806
7 Attorney for Plaintiff
8 Smith & Lowney, PLLC
9 2317 E. John St.
10 Seattle, WA 98112
11 Telephone: (206) 860-2883
12 Fax: (206) 860-4187
13 E-mail: rasmithwa@igc.org
14 briank@igc.org
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29